

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Applicants would like to thank the examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. By the present amendment, claims 1-11 and 13-25 remain in the application while claims 11, 17-19, 22, and 23 are amended. Claim 12 is canceled, and new claim 26 is added without introducing new matter. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claim 12 has been canceled in the present application while its feature has been incorporated into amended independent claim 11. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 11 has been amended to direct to “a computer readable recording medium”, to comply with the requirements set forth in MPEP § 2106. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

***Claim Objections***

Claims 19-23 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form. Claims 17-19 and 22-23 have been amended accordingly to comply with the requirements set forth in MPEP § 608.01(n), and thus, the objection as it applies to the claims is moot.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

Claims 1, 9, 10, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Maenishi *et al.* (US 6,971,161 B1, hereinafter “Maenishi”). The rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Independent claims 1 and 9, in part, require “in such a manner that mounting time at each component mounting machine is equalized”. Maenishi, however, is silent about the allocating step to equalize the mounting time at each component mounting machine as required in claims 1 and 9. The passages cited by the examiner (col. 1, lines 5-65; col. 2, lines 10-53; and claim 1) in the Office action teach a method and device for generating component mounting data in view of general requirements such as productivity, quality assurance, or safety, and teach a method and device for mounting components based on the generated component mounting data. By contrast, Maenishi does not explicitly teach those requirements include a specific rule that “mounting time at each component mounting machine is equalized”. As Maenishi fails to teach all limitations as required in claims, applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 9 are allowable over the reference, and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Regarding independent claim 13, it explicitly requires “an actual production information obtaining step of obtaining actual production information regarding a state after actual production start from each component mounting machine”. By contrast, Maenishi discloses “preparing component information about a plurality of components to be placed onto a mounting target” (see col. 2, lines 13-17 and claim 1), but does not teach the above-mentioned limitation as required in claim 13. Therefore, applicants respectfully submit that claim 13 is allowable over the reference, and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Claim 10 depends from independent claim 9 and is, therefore, allowable for at least the reasons provided in support of the allowability of claim 9.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

Claims 7, 8, 11, 12, and 14-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maenishi.

Regarding independent claim 11, as stated above with respect to the patentability of claim 1, it requires “in such a manner that mounting time at each component mounting machine is equalized”. Maenishi, however, is silent about the limitation as required in claim 11. Therefore, applicants respectfully submit that claim 11 is allowable over the reference, and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Claims 7, 8, and 14-25 depend from claim 1 or 13 and are, therefore, allowable for at least the reasons provided in support of the allowability of claims 1 and 13.

Claim 12 has been canceled in the present application.

Claims 2-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maenishi in view of Ohsawa *et al.* (US 5,625,832). Claims 2-4 depend from independent claim 1 and are, therefore, allowable for at least the reasons provided in support of the allowability of claim 1.

Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maenishi in view of Takano *et al.* (US 6,729,018 B1). Claims 5 and 6 depend from independent claim 1 and are, therefore, allowable for at least the reasons provided in support of the allowability of claim 1.

Claim 26 has been newly added to the application. Claim 26 is patentable as it does not introduce any new matter and it defines further features not disclosed in or suggested by the cited references.

In consideration of the foregoing analysis, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is

Appln. No. 10/597,285  
Amendment dated July 13, 2009  
Reply to Office Action dated April 13, 2009

determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No.: NGB 40648.

Respectfully submitted,  
PEARNE & GORDON, LLP

By: /michaelwgarvey/  
Michael W. Garvey, Reg. No. 35878

1801 East 9<sup>th</sup> Street  
Suite 1200  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108  
(216) 579-1700

Date: July 13, 2009